



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/525,270

11/07/2005

Henrik Sundstrom

9563-27

4991

54414

7590

02/03/2009

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC, P.A.

P.O. BOX 37428

RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER

BUI, HANH THI MINH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2192

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/03/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/525,270	Applicant(s) SUNDSTROM, HENRIK	
	Examiner HANH T. BUI	Art Unit 2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Applicant's amendment dated November 6th, 2008 responding to the June 6th, 2008 Office Action provided in the rejection of claims 1-16.
2. Claims 1- 16 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 7, and 16 are in independent form and which have been fully considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicants' arguments filed on November 6th, 2008 have been considered but are not persuasive. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1-16 under section 103(a), which was mailed on June 6th, 2008 is maintained.

REMARKS

4. Answers To Applicant's Arguments:
 - a. **Argument:** Kabushiki merely recognizes a file extension (which the Action identifies as analogous to a "property") and matches it with the appropriate application. (See Remarks pg. 6: 12-13).

Answer: Examiner asserts that Kabushiki discloses "The document management application is for filing the **document data prepared by a word processor**. The drawing data management application is for filing **the drawing data (CAD)** by a personal computer ... As for drawing data, a plurality files are generated for each drawing ... work sheet file, a net file, and a plotter file ..."
(emphasis added – See Col. 9: 52-Col. 10: 19.)

It should be noted that word processor is a program that allows the user to create/edit a word document, and CAD is the use of computer technology to aid in the design particularly the drafting (technical drawing and engineering drawing) of a part or product, therefore after preparing a document and/or a file (e.g., word, text, autoCAD drawing ...) the prepared document and/ or file should be saved with a file extension, which identifies a data file's format or the application used to create the file, such as, .doc, .txt, .dwg ... Because the file extension can be used to identify a data file's format therefore it can be one of the properties of the prepared file.

b. **Argument:** Applicant submits that Keveney does not relate to matching a property, *i.e.*, color depth, width of picture, height of picture and/or animation information and generating an indication of whether the file can be used based on the matching (See Remarks pg. 6: 17-20).

Answer: Examiner noted that Office Action dated June 6th, 2008, examiner applied Kabushiki to reject "matching a property Generating an indication ..." claimed limitation and examiner only relied upon Keveney for teaching "*the property comprises color depth, width of picture, height of picture and/or animation information*" as applied herein.

Furthermore, Keveney discloses steps to create animations in a CAD program including drawing (***the type of file***) with ***color*** (See Pg. 2: first para.) and ***animation information***.

Art Unit: 2192

c. **Argument:** Applicant submits that no reasons have been presented to support the combination of Kabushiki and Keveney (See Remarks pg. 6: 4-10).

Answer: Examiner respectfully disagrees because in the Office Action dated June 6th, 2008, examiner had provided the reason to combine Kabushiki and Keveney (See pg. 7: 1st par.). Furthermore, background grouping would have made the manipulation individual parts easier without disturbing other things in the drawing as suggested by Keveney (See pg. 2: 1st par.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kabushiki (European Patent Application EP0311807 – hereinafter, Kabushiki) in view of “How I made these animations”, Published 2001 by Matt Keveney (hereinafter - Keveney).**

Regarding claim 1:

Kabushiki discloses a *method of determining usability of a coded file in an application, the method including:*

- *obtaining at least one property of the coded file*

Art Unit: 2192

(Col. 9: line 56 through Col. 10: line 19; "... document management application (**coded file**) ... drawing data management application (**coded file**)...

As for drawing data, a plurality of files are generated for each drawing. In this instance, these files are a work sheet file, a net file, and a plotter file... The net file describes relative positions and connections of parts in the drawing

(properties of coded file) ..." - emphasis added.).

- *generating an indication indicating whether or not the file can be used in the application based on the matching*

(Col. 9: lines 56-59; "the application flag (**indication**) of the main header portion is used for **indicating** the document management **application** or the drawing data management **application**" - emphasis added.)

- *matching the property against at least one application where the file could be used; and associating the indication with the coded file for later enabling of a decision about use of the file in the application*

Examiner noted it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to recognize that since at least Windows 95 any application file is coded some way virtually, which means all file extensions are associated to application programs. Therefore, the search mechanism of Window operating system can match the property against at least one application where the file could be used.

- *wherein the application uses a certain type of file but has limitations regarding the properties of the type of file.*

Art Unit: 2192

(Col. 10: lines 2-19; “As for drawing data (***the type of file***), ***a plurality of files*** are generated for each drawing. In this instance, theses files are a work sheet file, a net file, and a plotter file (***certain type of file***)... The net file describes relative positions and connections of parts in the drawing (***properties of the type of file***)...” - emphasis added.).

But, Kabushiki does not explicitly teach

- *the property comprises color depth, width of picture, height of picture and/or animation information.*

However, Keveney discloses steps to create animations in a CAD program including drawing (***the type of file***) with ***color*** (See Pg. 2: first par.) and ***animation information.***

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Keveney into the teachings of Kabushiki because such combination would have reduce the work load so more pictures can be published faster as suggested by Keveney (See Pg. 1: fourth par.)

Regarding claim 2:

Kabushiki and Keveney disclose *a method of claim 1*

- *wherein the at least one property is more than one property and the more than one property is matched against each application*

(Kabushiki further discloses “the data of one page contains a work sheet data file, a drawing data file (net file), and an image expanded picture (plotter

Art Unit: 2192

file)” (See Col. 9: lines 38-40) and “under the drawing management **application**, these related files are systematically combined (**matched**) into one page” (emphasis added – See Col. 10: lines 10-12)).

- *generating a flag indicating that the file can be used if all matched properties of the coded file can be used in the application*

(Kabushiki further discloses in Col. 9: lines 56-59; “the **application flag** of the main header portion is used for **indicating** the document management **application** or the drawing data management **application**”, emphasis added.).

Regarding claim 3:

Kabushiki and Keveney disclose *a method of claim 1*

- *wherein the file is an image file,*

(Kabushiki further discloses in Col. 9: lines 54-56; “the drawing data management application is for filing the drawing data (CAD) (**image file**) by a personal computer” – emphasis added.).

Regarding claim 5:

Kabushiki and Keveney disclose *a method of claim 1*

- *checking the indication before using the file in an application associated with the indication*

(Kabushiki further discloses in Col. 22: lines 37-45; “the data as read out from optical disk 19 is loaded into page memory 14, while being exclusively ORing with the original data. The result of the exclusively ORing operation show

Art Unit: 2192

“0” when both data are coincident with each other, but shows a logical value other than “0” when both data are not coincident. Therefore, check to see if the operation results area all “0” suffices for the registered data check”).

Regarding claim 7:

Kabushiki discloses *an electronic device for determining usability of a coded file in an application comprising:*

- *at least one file matching unit associated with an application*

Examiner noted it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to recognize that since at least Windows 95 any application file is coded some way virtually, which means all file extensions are associated to application programs. Therefore, the search mechanism of Window operating system can be viewed as a file-matching unit to match the property against at least one application where the file could be used.

- *receive at least one property of the coded file*

(Col. 9: line 56 through Col. 10: line 19; “... document management application (**coded file**) ... drawing data management application (**coded file**)...

As for drawing data, a plurality of files are generated for each drawing. In this instance, these files are a work sheet file, a net file, and a plotter file... The net file describes relative positions and connections of parts in the drawing

(properties of coded file) ...” - emphasis added.).

- *generate an indication indicating whether or not the file can be used in the application based on the matching*

Art Unit: 2192

(Col. 9: lines 56-59; “the application flag (**indication**) of the main header portion is used for **indicating** the document management **application** or the drawing data management **application**” - emphasis added.)

- *match the property against the application; and associate the indication with the coded file for later enabling of a decision about use of the file in the application*

Examiner noted it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to recognize that since at least Windows 95 any application file is coded some way virtually, which means all file extensions are associated to application programs. Therefore, the search mechanism of Window operating system can match the property against at least one application where the file could be used.

- *wherein the application uses a certain type of file but has limitations regarding the properties of the type of file.*

(Col. 10: lines 2-19; “As for drawing data (**the type of file**), **a plurality of files** are generated for each drawing. In this instance, theses files are a work sheet file, a net file, and a plotter file (**certain type of file**)... The net file describes relative positions and connections of parts in the drawing (**properties of the type of file**)...” - emphasis added.).

But, Kabushiki does not explicitly teach

- *the property comprises color depth, width of picture, height of picture and/or animation information..*

Art Unit: 2192

However, Keveney discloses steps to create animations in a CAD program including drawing (***the type of file***) with color (See Pg. 2: first par.) and animation information.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Keveney into the teachings of Kabushiki because such combination would have reduce the work load so more pictures can be published faster as suggested by Keveney (See Pg. 1:fourth par.)

Regarding claim 12:

Kabushiki and Keveney disclose *an electronic device according to claim 7*

- *an application unit arranged to check the corresponding indication before using the coded file*

(Kabushiki further discloses in Col. 9: lines 56-59; “the ***application flag*** of the main header portion is used for ***indicating*** the document management application or the drawing data management application” - emphasis added.).

Regarding claim 13:

Kabushiki and Keveney disclose *an electronic device according to claim 7*

- *wherein the file matching unit is more than one file matching unit and each matching unit is associated with a corresponding application.*

Examiner noted that besides the search mechanism of Window operating system, there are many other matching techniques such as Run function. For

Art Unit: 2192

instance, when a user type in the name of the program, folder..., then the file will be displayed after a searching and matching mechanism performed.

Regarding claim 16:

Kabushiki discloses *a computer program product for determining usability of a coded file, the computer program product comprising:*

- *program code embodied in a computer-readable storage medium*

Kabushiki discloses in the abstract “an information processing apparatus is provided with a scanner (20) and a magnetic disc (28a) both for supplying the data to be stored, and an optical disk (19) for storing the supplied data”.

All the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kabushiki in view of Keveney and further in view of Betti et al. (Pub. No. US 2003/0026593 - hereinafter, Betti et al.)**

Regarding claim 4:

Art Unit: 2192

Kabushiki and Keveney disclose *a method according to claim 1*, but Kabushiki and Keveney do not explicitly teach

- *wherein the file is a sound file.*

However, Betti et al. discloses in abstract “decoding a data file, particularly of the MPEG type (**sound file**)”, emphasis added.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Betti et al. into the teachings of Kabushiki and Keveney because such combination would have provided a major advantage of MPEG compared to other video and audio coding formats is that MPEG files are much smaller for the same quality.

Regarding claim 6:

Kabushiki and Keveney disclose *a method according to claim 1*, but Kabushiki and Keveney do not explicitly teach

- *wherein the properties are obtained through decoding the code file*

However, Betti et al. discloses in paragraph [0087]; “The decoder 17 reconstructs the imaging contents of the original data flow 12 by decoding the MPEG file 13 frame by frame according to the CSM identification byte”

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Betti et al. into the teachings of Kabushiki and Keveney because such combination would have improved the file storage methods and obviating the need of large inconvenient HDDs as suggested by Betti et al. (See paragraph [0055]).

Regarding claim 8:

Kabushiki and Keveney disclose *a method according to claim 7*, but Kabushiki and Keveney do not explicitly teach

- *a file property extractor for obtaining the at least one property of the code file*

However, Betti et al. discloses in FIG.7 and the associated text, e.g. paragraph [0087]; “a decoder 17, particularly of the RS encode/decode type accordingly. The decoder 17 reconstructs the imaging contents of the original data flow 12 by decoding the MPEG file 13 frame by frame according to the CSM identification byte”. It is noted that as claim 11 recites “the file property extractor is a file decoder”; therefore the decoder 17 can be viewed as a file property extractor.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Betti et al. into the teachings of Kabushiki and Keveney because such combination would have improved the file storage methods and obviating the need of large inconvenient HDDs as suggested by Betti et al. (See paragraph [0055]).

Regarding claim 9:

Kabushiki and Keveney disclose *a method according to claim 7*, but Kabushiki and Keveney do not explicitly teach

- *wherein the file property extractor is arranged to extract more than one property of the file and the file matching unit is arranged to match all extracted properties relevant to the application”.*

However, Betti et al. discloses in FIG. 7 and the associated text, e.g., paragraph [0087]; “The decoder 17 reconstructs the imaging contents of the original data flow 12 by decoding the MPEG file 13 frame by frame according to the CSM identification byte”.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Betti et al. into the teachings of Kabushiki and Keveney because such combination would have improved the file storage methods and obviating the need of large inconvenient HDDs as suggested by Betti et al. (See paragraph [0055]).

Regarding claim 10:

Kabushiki and Keveney disclose *a method according to claim 7*, but Kabushiki and Keveney do not explicitly teach

- *wherein the file property extractor is arranged to store the property after extraction”.*

However, Betti et al. discloses in the abstract “storing parameters that are associated with corresponding different frames whose values are selected to provided a playing quality level requested by an end user”.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Betti et al. into the

Art Unit: 2192

teachings of Kabushiki and Keveney because such combination would have improved the file storage methods and obviating the need of large inconvenient HDDs as suggested by Betti et al. (See paragraph [0055]).

Regarding claim 11:

The rejection of base claim 7 is incorporated. All the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 8.

9. Claims 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kabushiki in view of Keveney and further in view of Tracy (US Patent 5,548,084 – hereinafter, Tracy).

Regarding claim 14:

Kabushiki and Keveney disclose *an electronic device according to claim 7*, but Kabushiki and Keveney do not explicitly teach

- *wherein the device is a portable communication device*

However, Tracy discloses in Col. 2: lines 27-28; “the electronic device 10 is preferably a **portable communication device** such as a two-way radio, cellular phone”, emphasis added.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tracy into the teachings of Kabushiki and Keveney because such combination would have provided the advantage of new technology applied in daily use, such as an

Art Unit: 2192

integrated light pipe can be used in a shielded housing for electronic devices as suggested by Tracy (See Col. 1: lines 35-36.)

Regarding claim 15:

The rejection of base claim 7 is incorporated. All the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 14.

Conclusion

10. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

11. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh T. Bui whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2192

(571) 270-1976. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 AM - 4:30PM / Monday-Thursday.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. T. B./

/Tuan Q. Dam/

Examiner, Art Unit 2192

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192